DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 065 HE 022 231

AUTHOR	Davis, Junius A.; Borders-Patterson, Anne
TITLE	Black Students in Predominantly White North Carolina Colleges and Universities, 1986: A Replication of a 1970 Study. College Board Report No. 86-7.
INSTITUTION	College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	86
NOTE	28p.
AVAILABLE FROM	College Board Publications, Box 886, New York, NY 10101 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Black Students; *College Environment; College Freshmen; *College Students; Higher Education; Questionnaires; Racial Attitudes; Racial Discrimination; *Racial Integration; *Racial Relations; State Surveys; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; Student Motivation
IDENTIFIERS	*North Carolina

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to gather responses to the question "what is it like to be a black student on a traditionally or predominantly white campus in 1986?" Responses were gathered by 22 black student leaders from 13 predominantly white campuses in North Carolina, using random samples of black first-year students at their institutions. This study replicates a study involving the same institutions in 1969-70. Following a description of the background and procedures of both studies, responses are discussed under the following categories: reasons for choice, contacts with the college of choice prior to entry, the high school experience, the first-year experience in college, perception of institutional policies and climate, plans for the future, and the black student's advice to prospective students. Conclusions include the following: (1) advancements have been made by all parties since 1970, including students, faculty and administrators of both races; (2) as before, black students come with fairly pragmatic career interests that their programs are perceived to serve; (3) there seems to be a greater sophistication about white colleges, the social climate, and the need for hard work; (4) for black students who are not athletes, the black athlete seems to be more a member of the athletic community than of the black student community; (5) the negative reactions of the group to traditional black institutions may offer reasons for the continued erosion of black student admissions in traditionally black institutions; (6) the importance of black faculty is underscored in both studies; and (7) black students in 1986 appear less uncomfortable, less likely to blame and attack the environment, and more adept at fitting in. The following are appended: a list of the institutions and their student interviewers; selected statistics on minority enrollment and interviews in the sample institutions, and the interview guide. (KM)

ED304065

College Board
Report

No. 86-7

Black Students in Predominantly White North Carolina Colleges and Universities, 1986: A Replication of a 1970 Study

Junius A. Davis
Anne Borders-Patterson

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

College Board

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Black Students in Predominantly White North Carolina Colleges and Universities, 1986: A Replication of a 1970 Study

Junius A. Davis
Anne Borders-Patterson

College Board Report No. 86-7

College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1986

Junius A. Davis is a principal educational scientist at the Research Triangle Institute.

Anne Borders-Patterson, a former research associate at Duke University's Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, is a standing consultant to the Research Triangle Institute.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our profound gratitude to the College Board, not only for its financial support of this and the earlier study, but also for its concern with the basic issues involved and for granting the necessary freedom, as before, to tell it the way we see it.

Researchers are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in College Board Reports do not necessarily represent official College Board position or policy.

The College Board is a nonprofit membership organization that provides tests and other educational services for students, schools, and colleges. The membership is composed of more than 2,500 colleges, schools, school systems, and education associations. Representatives of the members serve on the Board of Trustees and advisory councils and committees that consider the programs of the College Board and participate in the determination of its policies and activities.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from College Board Publications, Box 886, New York, New York 10101. The price is $6.

Copyright © 1986 by College Entrance Examination Board. All rights reserved.
College Board, Scholastic Aptitude Test, SAT, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Entrance Examination Board.
Printed in the United States of America.

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Background 1

Procedures and Techniques of the Original Study 1

Summary of Findings in the Original Study 1

Origin of the Replication Study 2

Procedures 2

The Black Student at the Point of Entry into the Predominantly White College in 1985 3

Reasons for Choice 3

Contacts with the College of Choice Prior to Entry 6

The High School Experience 7

The First-Year Experience in College 7

Perception of Institutional Policies and Climate 9

Plans for the Future 10

The Black Student's Advice to Prospective Students 10

Some Concluding Observations 11

Appendix A. Institutions Involved and Their Student Interviewers 13

Appendix B. Selected Statistics on Minority Enrollment and Number of Interviews Conducted with Black First-Year Students in the Sample Institutions 13

Appendix C: Interview Guide 14

Tables

1. Reactions of Black Freshmen in White Four-Year Institutions to Selected Reasons for Particular College Choice: 1970 vs. 1986 4

2. Reactions of Black Freshmen in White Two-Year Institutions to Selected Reasons for Particular College Choice: 1970 vs. 1986 5

3. Proportion of Students Reporting Financial Aid of Various Kinds, by Type of Institution 6

4. Proportion of Students Expressing Satisfaction with Selected Aspects of the College Experience, by Type of Institution 7

5. Proportion of Students with Various Plans for the Following Year, by Type of Institution 10

INTRODUCTION

What is it like to be a black student on a traditionally or predominantly white campus in 1986?

This report is a summary of what 22 black student leaders from 13 predominantly white campuses in North Carolina found in exploring this basic question with random samples of black first-year students at their institutions.

This inquiry was a rather exact replication of an earlier study involving the same institutions in the 1969–70 academic year, when the black presence was a relatively new experience for the institutions and their student bodies. Throughout the report that follows, the experiences and perceptions of the black freshmen in 1986 are compared with those of their 1970 cohort, toward determining the kinds of changes that appear to have taken place for the affected students and institutions.

BACKGROUND

In 1969–70, 12 years after Little Rock and the first civil rights bill for blacks since reconstruction, a small vanguard of blacks had enrolled in the traditionally white colleges and universities in North Carolina and elsewhere. But the beginning desegregation of higher education was far from smooth, at least in the four-year institutions. Two years earlier, police in North Carolina had used tear gas to disperse black students from the registrar's office of a prestigious white private university, which the black students had occupied with threats to burn the records unless they were awarded grade distributions congruent with those of white students; and protests about admissions procedures, particularly regarding purported racial bias in scholastic aptitude and achievement tests, were rampant.

A technical advisory panel of representatives from 10 North Carolina institutions was established and convened by the North Carolina Board of Higher Education to monitor a study of the validity of conventional scholastic aptitude tests for blacks entering traditionally white settings. While concurring in the need for review of admissions procedures, the panel quickly concluded that the more substantive issues in improving minority enrollment and retention lay not in the gate-keeping function of the admissions office, but in the broader adjustments of the institutions and these "new" students to one another. With regard to improvement of recruiting procedures, it was believed that a better understanding of the social, economic, and political forces that might restrict black students from aspiring and applying to white institutions was needed, and that knowing how the vanguard perceived and dealt with these pressures would be useful. With regard to academic performance and retention and to the institutions' inexperience in facilitating the learning and personal development of these "new" students, it was felt that the blacks then enrolled in predominantly white institutions could provide useful information on what kinds of adjustment problems they faced and what they or the institutions did or did not do to ease these problems. The College Board agreed to provide support for an activity that would illuminate these issues.

PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES OF THE ORIGINAL STUDY

Thus, while an examination of the validity of admissions procedures was otherwise in process from data of record,[1] black juniors and seniors at 13 interested North Carolina traditionally or predominantly white colleges (representing public and private four-year institutions, as well as public community colleges and technical institutes) were brought to a central location, provided a relatively open-ended but structured interview guide for review and amendment, and trained in interviewing techniques. These students then returned to their campuses for private interviews with a random sample of black freshmen near the end of their first academic year. Following the interviews and the receipt of their reports, the interviewers were reconvened to discuss what they had found. The report of findings was drawn from conclusions from this conference as well as from the students' written reports of their interviews, both of which constituted discussions among black students as to what they were experiencing. The principal investigators attempted to serve as recorders and reporters, rather than as interpreters.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS IN THE ORIGINAL STUDY

The results of the study were published in 1973 by the College Board as a special research report,[2] with the belief (later largely substantiated by studies elsewhere) that "the experience in North Carolina will be found to hold for many other places that have just now begun to change." Among the key findings were these quoted from the report abstract:

- Black students enrolled in white institutions appear to be attracted by such features as propinquity, low cost and/or financial aid, availability of a particular program of interest with definite vocational or professional role implications, and a conviction of quality of program . . . [and have] a personal history of successful performance in secondary school.

1. Davis, J. A., and Susan Kerner-Hoag. *Validity of Pre-Admissions Indices for Blacks and Whites in Six Traditionally White Public Universities in North Carolina*. Project Report 71-15. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, Sept. 1971.
2. Davis, J. A., and Anne Borders-Patterson. *Black Students in Predominantly White North Carolina Colleges and Universities*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1973.

- Few blacks in white institutions reported any effective assistance or encouragement from guidance counselors; instead, there was much evidence that both black and white guidance counselors were so uncertain about how to advise a black student considering a white institution that they avoided students seeking assistance. Rather, high school teachers, particularly those who teach English or mathematics, seem frequently to have been instrumental in encouraging the black student to attend a traditionally white institution.
- Marked differences were found between the reasons for choices, campus perceptions, and satisfactory adjustment to college of blacks attending white four-year (resident) institutions and those attending two-year (nonresident) institutions.
- Some black students who choose white four-year institutions seem to perceive them as being higher in quality than the traditionally black institutions or their degrees as having greater market value.
- Black students on white residential campuses seem to become increasingly polarized, to become more aware of their black identity, and, in many cases, to grow more hostile toward the "white establishment" as their college years progress. This seems to result from a variety of problems: difficulties in achieving a satisfactory social life; great diversity in values and in accepted behavior among socioeconomic classes; absence of black leadership of the whole student body (although the black student groups themselves provided some); the almost complete absence of black faculty members and guidance counselors; and great sensitivity to rebuffs which were usually attributed to racial prejudice. Noticeably infrequent were expressions of problems of a specifically academic nature.

ORIGIN OF THE REPLICATION STUDY

In 1985, almost two decades after the original study, the campuses were quieter but faced with new problems, principally the leveling off in the late 1970s and the decline, beginning about 1982, of the proportions of black high school seniors continuing in higher education. It was also noted that many social, economic, and cultural changes had taken place in society as a whole and in the institutions themselves. These changes included the continuing desegregation of the public schools; the increasing enrollment of blacks in traditionally or predominantly white higher education institutions;[3] the easier access of blacks to many careers where entry before was difficult or denied; the availability of federal and other kinds of student aid; the greater possibility of friends or relatives with experience in a traditionally white institution; and the emergence of the black athletic scholar. The original co-principal investigators and the original 13 institutions were interested in determining what changes, if any, had taken place over the intervening 17 years in incentives for entry into higher education and the nature of that experience. Accordingly, the authors embarked, in the 1985–86 academic year, on a rather exact replication of the original study, again with support from the College Board.

The 13 institutions included five four-year private colleges or universities, four public universities, and four two-year public institutions (two community colleges and two technical institutes). The number of black first-year students, the target of the inquiry, ranged from 15 to 80 for the private institutions (representing from 4 to 11 percent of the freshman class); from 190 to 522 at the four-year public institutions (representing from 9 to 15 percent of the freshman class); and from about 200 to 1,900 at the two-year institutions (where blacks constituted from about 16 to 30 percent of the total enrollment).

PROCEDURES

First, each of the presidents or chancellors of the 13 institutions appointed, from the faculty or administrative staff, an institutional representative to assist with the study. These representatives were asked to nominate one or more black student leaders from among those in the later class years who had distinguished themselves through thoughtful and intensive concern about the issues of particular interest to black students and who could communicate this concern effectively to others. One nominee was accepted from each of the five private four-year institutions, where the number of black first-year students was small; from the public institutions, where black freshman enrollment was much larger, two nominees were accepted. All nominees contacted expressed willingness to join in the research activity.

Working from the original interview protocol, the co-principal investigators developed an updated interview guide for use with black freshmen in 1985–86. Where possible, content and format were made consistent with the 1969–70 interview protocol to facilitate comparisons with the earlier findings. The resulting protocol was shared with an advisory panel of representatives from the General Administration of the University of North Carolina System, the North Carolina Department of Community Colleges, and the North Carolina Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, and

3. Marks, working from the Higher Education General Information Surveys of the National Center for Education Statistics, estimated that in 1982, 64 percent of the headcount enrollment of black students in college in the 14 Southern Regional Education Board states were enrolled in predominantly white colleges – up from 18 percent in 1965 (Marks, J. L. *Black Participation in Undergraduate Education: The 1980s, Critical Transition Years*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1985). For the United States as a whole, about 84 percent of black students in higher education in 1982 were enrolled in other than traditionally black institutions (National Center for Education Statistics. *The Condition of Education, 1985*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1985, p. 106).

further revisions were made. The resulting interview guide was organized into seven topical areas: reasons for choice of institution; high school and family experience prior to college enrollment; contacts with the institution prior to enrollment; the first-year personal experience; perception of institutional policies and climate, and recommendations for change; plans for the future; and advice the respondent would give to other blacks considering enrollment at that institution.

The prospective student interviewers were convened in early March 1986 for a day and a half on one of the campuses represented to review (with the co-principal investigators and institutional, system, or sponsor representatives) the study objectives against their campus experiences and ideas; to examine and revise the updated version of the interview protocol; to receive training (through observation and role playing) in interview procedures; and to go over instructions for their data-gathering activities. It was stressed in this conference that the principal investigators were not attempting to use the students for any purposes of the investigators, but providing an opportunity for the students to use the principal investigators for their own purposes. The students then returned to their campuses, where the institutional representatives had drawn random samples of black first-year students for interviews (with backups in the case of refusal or attrition for other causes). The interview protocol was revised in terms of the suggestions made, and forms were mailed to the interviewers. (See Appendix C for a copy of the final interview protocol.)

Of the 21 interviewer nominees, 19 subsequently conducted interviews (averaging one hour each) with up to 15 first-year black students. The interviewers were instructed to mail in their first two completed protocols for critical review and feedback by the co-principal investigators before proceeding with the remainder; most were able to do so. A "hotline" was maintained by the co-principal investigators for answering questions that arose during the period designated for conducting the interviews (March 17–April 11, 1986), and thus progress was generally monitored. On April 13, when 252 of the potential 315 assigned interviews had been completed and with each of the 13 campuses represented, the interviewers were reconvened to discuss their findings with the project staff and to challenge each other's interpretations. The report of findings that follows is drawn from their recorded answers on the interview protocol forms and from study of a recording of the debriefing and discussion session, where the group considered the basic questions they had asked and debated the meaning of their findings.

THE BLACK STUDENT AT THE POINT OF ENTRY INTO THE PREDOMINANTLY WHITE COLLEGE IN 1985

Reasons for Choice

As in 1969–70, an overwhelming majority of black students stated that a prime reason for going to college was preparation for a particular career. This pragmatism was expressed in a variety of ways, but most frequently in terms of planning to enter a particular profession or career requiring programmatic training at the higher education level, with the program of concern one represented in the college curriculum. Some were still in the process of refining their career objectives, but few were much taken with the simple notions of higher education as a broadening experience, as a "shopping trip" to find an area of interest, or as general background for a variety of career options. This pursuit of a particular vocational option from the beginning was characteristic of the majority of four-year college students, as well as those in the two-year colleges or technical institutes.

For those in the four-year institutions in particular, a degree from a traditionally white institution was generally perceived to have greater market value than a degree from a traditionally black institution. This too was in agreement with the findings in 1970. However, the 1986 black freshmen seemed to display considerably more sophistication in their selection of a white institution than did their 1970 cohorts, for whom "quality" tended to be equated with any traditionally white institution. The current group seemed better able to recognize and discuss differences among institutions considered (in terms of cost, size, programs and facilities, selectivity and levels of academic competition, and academic standing among other institutions) and less likely to group all traditionally white or all traditionally black institutions into a single level of quality.

Although there were some differences between the 1985–86 freshmen in the public and private four-year colleges in the alternatives they reported considering, both groups had done considerable shopping in their search for a college. For the private college students, all individuals contacted had actively considered and applied to at least one other institution, and some reported applications to as many as four institutions; the average number actively considered was 2.3. The majority of the alternate institutions (about 80 percent) were traditionally white, though about 44 percent of the students had actively considered at least one traditionally black institution (TBI). For the four-year public institutions, the multiple-application tendency also held, with more than 90 percent applying to one or more additional institutions; the average number considered was 1.9. Of the alternate institutions for the public university freshmen, about one-third were TBIs, and a little more than half the students in this group had considered at least one TBI.

Whether or not students had included TBIs in their visits or as active alternatives, virtually none admitted any serious or sustaining interest in the TBIs. Their reasons for discarding this option, or the disadvantages perceived, seemed to center about several themes: the impression that the institutions were of poorer quality, with particular emphasis on the belief that the market value of the degree would be less; the warmer reception (personalized letters, telephone calls, attentiveness during visits) by the traditionally white cam-

Table 1. Reactions of Black Freshmen in White Four-Year Institutions to Selected Reasons for Particular College Choice: 1970 vs. 1986

Reason	Students in four-year institutions, 1970 (N = 109)			Students in four-year institutions, 1986 (N = 159)		
	Yes	No	?	Yes	No	?
1. Items represented in 1970 and 1986 interviews						
"Get better education in white college"	67%	23%	10%	64%	25%	11%
"College close to home"	74	20	6	58	37	5
"Low cost of education here"	42	56	2	39	56	5
"Good scholarship or aid offer"	64	35	1	60	31	9
"Visited campus and liked it"	41	57	2	72	25	3
"Had the program I wanted"	72	17	10	84	8	6
"Made to feel wanted by the college"	36	53	11	65	23	12
"Recruited by an athletic coach"	14	86	0	21	77	2
"Interested in athletic program"	27	72	1	31	65	4
"Better chance for good job, salary"	76	19	5	83	4	13
"Chance to speak more forcefully as a black"	42	44	14	35	41	24
"Heard good reports from friends here"	44	54	2	50	44	6
"Parents wanted me to come here"	47	48	5	50	36	14
"Others in family have come here"	12	88	0	19	72	9
"Close friend also planning to come here"	31	69	0	36	60	4
"Was actively recruited by the college"	19	75	6	46	47	7
"Someone (not parent or friend) recommended"	55	44	1	–	–	–
"Size of school"	58	35	6	65	30	5
2. Items represented only in 1986 interviews						
"Advised to come by teacher"				37	59	4
"Advised to come by guidance counselor"				43	53	4
"Advised to come by coach"				22	75	3
"Academic reputation of institution"				86	9	5
"Reputation of institution in sports"				23	73	4
"Opportunities for social life"				31	48	21
"Size of black student population"				26	62	12
"Felt could meet academic requirements"				94	2	4
"Opportunities for special academic help"				70	18	12
"Recommended by other black students who have attended"				42	56	2

puses; the belief that it would be too easy to put social life above academics on the traditionally black campuses; an occasional comment about the fiscal instability or limited resources of black institutions; and, significantly we believe, the feeling that they would be uncomfortable in an all-black setting (e.g., "It's not the real world"; "I feel more comfortable in a mixed environment"; "I didn't grow up in a traditional black setting"; or as one student put it, "I like standing out"). A few black freshmen stated that they were interested in learning how to get along with the white majority, but these were quite few in numbers compared with those so reporting in 1970.

The foregoing observations as to the college choice behavior of the black freshmen were drawn from the record of responses to the open-ended questions about institutions considered and rationales involved in their choice processes. Interviewees were also presented with a formal list of reasons for choice and were asked to state whether each reason was important or not in their decision to attend the institution in which they had enrolled. This served, then, to verify and summarize what they had more generally to say about their decision process; it also offered a chance to make more direct comparisons to responses of the 1970 group to identical questions. A summary of the responses is provided in Tables 1 and 2.

Before examining these data in detail, it should be noted that although attempts were made to draw random samples of the black freshmen enrolled on each campus in the spring term, the proportions cited need to be observed with considerable caution. Generalization of data to an individual college is not reasonable, both because of the small numbers of students involved and the inevitable variations among interviewers in presenting the response options; and, although the larger group of institutions are representative only of themselves and (strictly speaking) not North Carolina higher education, the proportions of students in the interview sample varied from institution to institution (see Appendix B). Although the statistical procedures of weighting and tests

Table 2. Reactions of Black Freshmen in White Two-Year Institutions to Selected Reasons for Particular College Choice: 1970 vs. 1986

Reason	Students in two-year institutions, 1970 (N = 55)			Students in two-year institutions, 1986 (N = 93)		
	Yes	No	*	Yes	No	*
1. Items represented in 1970 and 1986 interviews						
"Get better education in white college"	32%	58%	10%	23%	73%	4%
"College close to home"	91	9	0	89	10	1
"Low cost of education here"	93	7	0	89	8	3
"Good scholarship or aid offer"	70	22	8	42	56	2
"Visited campus and liked it"	76	23	1	52	46	2
"Had the program I wanted"	96	4	0	88	10	2
"Made to feel wanted by the college"	86	10	4	64	25	11
"Recruited by an athletic coach"	5	95	0	0	100	0
"Interested in athletic program"	36	60	4	5	94	1
"Better chance for good job, salary"	76	13	11	84	12	4
"Chance to speak more forcefully as a black"	49	40	11	34	45	21
"Heard good reports from friends here"	67	31	2	57	41	2
"Parents wanted me to come here"	83	17	0	53	47	0
"Others in family have come here"	22	78	0	43	57	0
"Close friend also planning to come here"	65	33	2	46	47	7
"Was actively recruited by the college"	37	63	0	13	85	2
"Someone (not parent or friend) recommended"	62	38	0	–	–	–
"Size of school"	57	34	9	34	65	1
2. Items represented only in the 1986 interviews						
"Advised to come by teacher"				17	83	0
"Advised to come by guidance counselor"				16	84	0
"Advised to come by coach"				0	99	1
"Academic reputation of institution"				66	28	6
"Reputation of institution in sports"				0	98	2
"Opportunities for social life"				37	56	7
"Size of black student population"				20	73	7
"Felt could meet academic requirements"				95	2	3
"Opportunities for special academic help"				76	17	7
"Recommended by other black students who have attended"				41	56	3

of statistical significance could be employed, it was felt that this would imply a level of integrity for the numerical data that simply is not there. The results are accordingly best viewed as approximations drawn from case study methods and subject to more rigorous specification in a study of a different kind. As hypotheses for further verification about differences over the period of concern, they may be provocative. Finally, in our discussion of the results, interpretive comment is generally restricted to differences that were also evident in the larger interview material, or in the summary discussions of the interviewers.

The apparently greater sophistication of the current black freshmen about higher education options has been noted. Some of the responses to the checklist of reasons for attending the college of choice suggest a possible basis for this greater sophistication. For example, about 1 in 5 (as opposed to 1 in 8 in 1970) in the four-year institutions and 4 in 10 (versus 2 in 10 in 1970) in the two-year institutions reported that the institution of choice had been attended by a family member, and 4 in 10 at each institutional level reported that it had been recommended to them by other black students who had attended. For the four-year institutions, a substantial 72 percent (against 41 percent in 1970) reported that they had visited the campus and found it attractive, and substantially fewer emphasized nearness of college to home. These black freshmen were, not infrequently, individuals who had been unfavorably impressed by visits to traditionally black campuses. It should also be noted that at two of the four-year institutions a significant proportion of the freshmen turned out to be highly recruited black athletes, whose choice had been largely among coaches and athletic scholarships rather than among institutions and academic programs.

The data in Tables 1 and 2 accentuate again the differences between the explanations given by students at the two- and four-year institutions for their choice. There was, overall, less of a sense among the community college students that their college was essentially white (as noted, the student bodies at these institutions ranged from about 16 to 30

percent black). Even more than those in the four-year institutions, the community college students were responding to a particular program of interest (these institutions present, of course, well-defined vocational and technical programs). In short, the community college students were those living in the counties served by the public community colleges, for whom the relatively low tuition (about $150 per academic year for full-time students) and other cost-saving features were necessarily attractive and who were strongly pragmatic in their particular aspirations.

Although about twice as many two-year college students noted in 1986 that others in their family had attended the institution, the principal shift since 1970 appears to be in the degree to which such students felt they had been actively sought after or recruited by the institution. Only about 1 in 8 in 1986 (compared with almost 4 in 10 in 1970) reported as a reason for choice that they were actively recruited; although almost two-thirds in 1986 reported that they had been made to feel wanted by the institution, almost 9 in 10 of the 1970 two-year college sample answered similarly. But, for about 9 out of 10 of these students in both years, their reasons for choosing the institution involved the fact that it was close to home, that its cost was low, and that it offered the particular program wanted.

Contacts with the College of Choice Prior to Entry

One section of the interview dealt with contacts with the college prior to entrance, with particular regard to the institutions' efforts to attract black students either through formal recruiting procedures or through financial aid incentives of one sort or another.

In 1970, representatives of the senior institutions were generally outspoken in their belief that unusual efforts, ingenuity, and budget were expended in order to recruit minority students. However, these representatives were equally convinced that their prodigious effort paid few dividends, and only about one in five of the black freshmen interviewed in 1970 affirmed that they were actively recruited by the institution. In 1986, however, minority recruitment appeared to be rather formally institutionalized (e.g., one or more minority recruiters doing business as usual in the admissions offices, rather than a variety of dramatic efforts by the admissions staff generally), and more than twice as many black freshmen (see Table 1) reported they had been actively recruited by the institution. About two-thirds of the freshmen (almost twice as many as in 1970) stated that being made to feel wanted by the college was a factor in their decision to enroll at that institution. This theme was echoed in their responses to other questions, where the mechanisms were personalized letters, telephone calls, and cordial receptions in visits to the campus. Being seen as a valued prospective student was reported more frequently for the traditionally white colleges considered; the TBIs were sometimes perceived as pro forma in their pre-admissions contacts. In any event, the perception of being wanted by a white college seemed to be a powerful incentive and a result that was achieved by courtesy and responsiveness rather than inordinate wooing.

Table 3. Proportion of Students Reporting Financial Aid of Various Kinds, by Type of Institution

Form of aid	Type of institution		
	Four-year public (N = 93)	Four-year private (N = 66)	Two-year public (N = 93)
Pell Grant	54%	49%	36%
Work study	24	22	14
NDSL	31	19	1
Church	10	5	0
Athletic scholarship	2	41	0
SEOG	8	13	5
GSL	16	27	1
State grant	5	38	0
Other	40	40	17

In some cases, of course, these were athletic recruitments, with choice based (as suggested earlier) more on the personal relationship established with a coach or by the amount of financial incentives offered. One student reported, for example, that he was helped in his choice because the coach did everything for him: "filled out my application, made arrangements for housing, and everything." One student reported that he took his second-choice coach when his first-choice coach at another institution in the sample was fired. Yet, this was counterbalanced by another black student at the institution with the coaching problem: "When [the coach] who recruited me was fired, and I lost my place, I decided to come here anyway. I liked the academic program."

Most of the students felt that the information they had been provided with by the institution prior to entrance was helpful and sufficient, with the most frequent exceptions being information about remedial or special courses or about the social life on the campus. Although few reported any personal contact with a financial aid officer prior to entrance, most were satisfied with what they had learned about costs and aid. A few would have liked more information about specific programs of study.

As confirmed by the data in Table 1, the availability of financial aid was frequently mentioned as an important factor in choice for the four-year college student. This was even more frequently apparent in their answers to the open-ended questions, when a number of the students indicated that they had ultimately selected the institution making the best offer of financial aid or stated that of the several reasons for choice, this was a paramount consideration. Most interviewers asked, and most interviewees (94 percent) responded to, a question asking for an inventory of sources and amounts of financial aid. The responses with regard to type of aid are given in Table 3.

Although loans were not the most frequent form of aid, a significant proportion of the four-year institution students reported assistance of this kind. These students were asked to estimate their indebtedness at the point of graduation. The amounts given by those with loans ranged from relatively small sums to as much as $20,000, with averages (for the students with loans) of $4,600 for the four-year public institution students and $6,600 for the four-year private students.

THE HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

The majority of the current generation of freshmen came from high schools that were predominantly white, with the median percentage of black students at the secondary school of graduation about 45 percent for those attending the public institutions and about 35 percent for those attending the four-year private institutions. Black students were in the majority for the high school classes represented for about 13 percent of the private institution freshmen and about 25 percent of the two-year or four-year public institution freshmen. Only about 8 percent of the freshmen in the total group came from high schools where 75 percent or more of the students were black.

An overwhelming majority of the black freshmen reported that they felt the quality of their high school preparation for college was very good or generally adequate; this held without relationship to the proportion of black students represented in the high school population. Many had taken honors courses, and virtually none felt they had been misled by their high school teachers or staff about their ability to handle college-level work. Most had been active in extracurricular activities with athletics a frequent (but not overwhelming) area. Although the teachers, not the guidance counselors, were frequently cited in 1970 as influential in the college selection process, guidance counselors were mentioned in the general conversations as frequently as teachers in this regard in 1986.

Although the two-year public institution students were more likely than students in the other two categories to state that the general climate in college was no different from that in their high schools, the majority of students in each category felt that college represented a change. Frequent themes involved greater academic emphasis or having to work harder, combined with greater freedom and the consequent need for more self-discipline. Some students, more frequently those in the four-year private institutions, stated they had felt more comfortable with the other blacks at their high schools than with the other blacks at their college; this may have been a function of the numbers of black students or simply, as one student stated, "I was at home." Another factor suggested by some of the responses was that the groups of black students in college were found to be more heterogeneous in their values or in their sense of identity vis-à-vis white students, for example, "Some of the black students here don't seem to realize they are black," or "We are too few; many of us lose our identities as blacks."

Table 4. Proportion of Students Expressing Satisfaction with Selected Aspects of the College Experience, by Type of Institution

Aspect of college or college life	Proportion of students expressing satisfaction		
	Four-year public (N = 93)	Four-year private (N = 66)	Two-year public (N = 93)
Academic performance (grades)	42%	41%	42%
Amount of work required	50	50	50
Teachers' knowledge of subject matter	74	86	79
Teachers' ability to teach	48	74	59
Availability of special help	80	76	78
Fairness of grading practices	67	74	70
Attitudes of faculty toward black students	50	68	58
Attitude of administrators toward black students	43	48	45
Help received from academic adviser	50	59	54
Social life on campus	63	24	47
Local black community	28	39	33

THE FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE IN COLLEGE

Students were asked to evaluate their college experience thus far, both through giving their reactions to specific aspects and through responding to open-ended or probing but unstructured questions about the nature of the overall experience. Table 4 presents reactions to 11 specific aspects of college life, where students were asked to report whether they were satisfied, indifferent or undecided, or not satisfied. It is significant, we feel, that (with two exceptions) reactions are generally positive across the three institutional groups. The exceptions are campus social life at the private institutions and the local black (external) community (where the majority in the public institution groups were indifferent or undecided). The proportions expressing satisfaction with the availability of special help, the teachers' knowledge of their subject matter, and the fairness of grading practices suggest a more comfortable feeling of acceptance than was evident on these campuses in 1970.

The more open-ended questions (e.g., What do you like or dislike? How is this college different from what you expected? How have you changed? How do you feel about the other black [white] students here?) elicited a more thoughtful set of responses. These reactions, though not at odds with the summary data in Table 4, gave deeper

perspectives. The interview questions in this area closely paralleled those used in 1970.

In 1970, the most prevalent situation was one of moderate-to-strong shock: black students had come with the highest expectations for a good experience in an elite setting. Being accepted by a traditionally white college told them they had "made it." They soon found growing discomfort, particularly with the overall peer culture, in this new environment; as one student said then, they tended to become "bitterer and blacker."

A few students in the 1986 group reflected the growing polarization that had been a dominant theme in 1970. For example, one 1986 freshman said, "Being a black on this campus, I have become stronger in my beliefs about my blackness." But she added, "I am disappointed about the lack of concern of other black students about their heritage." Although the "becoming blacker" theme was an infrequent comment, the follow-up statement expressed what seemed to be a significant difference in the current generation of black freshmen: Their reaction was neither an unexpected but strong feeling of uneasiness with white students nor an interpretation of any slighting or abrasive remark by a white student as evidence of rampant and general prejudice. Rather, it was an expression of a feeling that black students were not operating as a distinct and unified body (one said, "I've become more cynical of whites in general, as well as of blacks in general").

There were no misconceptions about the presence of prejudice in some contacts: A group of whites had thrown a bottle at one interviewee, and particular individuals were seen as distant or particularly naïve about blacks by some respondents. Yet, in 1986, these incidents were almost always seen as a characteristic of the individual white student or of a white student clique than of white students generally. Black students in 1986 were more frequently "amused" (one student's word) by incidents with white students. One said, "I just don't associate with those [white students] who aren't cool." Another commented, "I'm not sure if what they [a group of whites] were saying was racial, or if they were just being silly, because they stay at such a distance." One girl was distressed by her white roommate's sloppiness, and stated emphatically that she had found white people to be "filthy" in spite of their "closets full of clothes." But the more frequent characterization of the white peers was "Most of them are all right," or "If a white student says something I disagree with, I'll just tell him that I disagree, and go on about my business." Still another expressed it this way: "I have a lot of white friends – or people I'm friendly with. But my black friends are my special friends."

In 1970 it was characteristic of black freshmen to cluster closer together as they experienced growing alienation between themselves and white students in general. This trend also was remarkably absent in 1986 for most students on all campuses, even though some campuses seemed to have a particular opponent that served in some sense to unify the black students (e.g., the Confederate-oriented Kappa Alpha Fraternity on one campus, an administration that had failed to recognize Martin Luther King Day on another). The black freshmen in 1986 seemed more frequently to be somewhat diffuse or to represent several distinct subgroups. On several of the campuses, the interviewers noted that there were two distinct and different groups of black students on the campus: the athletes and all other blacks, with the latter characterized by such terms as "those interested in getting a good education" or "those seriously interested in the academic aspects of college." The athletes, it seemed, tended to be consumed by their sports interests and activities and to associate principally with their white and black teammates; to the other black or white students on campus, the athletes were stars first and only incidentally or secondarily blacks. On some other campuses where athletes represented a smaller proportion of the black student body, the subgroups became less distinct. Here, they tended to consist of those who identified primarily with other black students and those who identified with students in general, or who were perceived by some of the freshmen in the former group as "elitists" or more like the white students than their circle of black friends. This kind of distinction was seldom emphasized by an individual student, and it is possible that what the investigators detected was simply less pressure to line up as a unified black front, with students now representing different degrees of persistent self-identification as a black in a white majority – or with students falling into such familiar groups as the serious academics, the party crowd, the organization joiners, etc. Some students lamented this kind of situation, with comments such as "It's hard to get us together to take a stand on matters important for black students." However, most were aware that they were in actuality a minority in a majority world (e.g., "It's hard to be the only female black freshman," or "You realize you are black when you find there are only one or two of you in the class").

Few of the black freshmen were much involved in campus clubs or organizations. The interviewers tended to interpret this in the light of their own experience, with the frequent reaction that the black clubs or organizations were relatively sterile or were lacking in purpose or activity in which they could become consumed. Some saw most organizations as "for upper-class whites," with the black organizations containing too few members: "There are so few of us, except in athletics – so few black academics." An attempt by one individual to get involved in an organization resulted in the response, "But your suggestion isn't part of our purpose." The absence of unifying and attracting purpose seemed to be central: "All you get out of it is free rides to conventions," or "They have speakers to try to get you interested, but it doesn't work that way." Some mixers where comparable black and white groups (e.g., fraternities or sororities) attempted to get together (or where activity was shared) seemed not to be working as a unifying force. On one campus, for example, a multi-organization dance had periods

of "white music, when they danced, then black music, when we danced." In these activities, as in the classroom, blacks were blacks and whites were whites, and the inevitable distinction of feeling different was somewhat troublesome – but not constantly painful or severe enough for organization and attack by the blacks. Neither was there, apparently, any strong provocation by the whites. The differences appeared to be accepted by both sides.

The classroom experiences sometimes served, as noted above, to keep the students aware that they were blacks in a white majority system. This most frequently seemed to be a function of the small numbers of blacks relative to whites, but it sometimes was associated with situations where the black student felt intimidated by the instructor, or felt the reaction to questions raised was that they were "dumb" questions. As in 1970, there seemed to be an awareness that black students in general received lower grades than whites, but there were relatively few if any interpretations of this phenomenon as the result of prejudice by the instructors – rather, it was now seen as a function of not being adequately prepared for the particular topic, of deficiencies in basic skills, or of failure to work hard enough. The white faculty members that predominated were generally seen as interested in teaching or in research, and partial neither to black nor white students: "You can detect a slight prejudice in some, but most of them are all right."

As before, the students felt that more black faculty and administrators were needed; these appeared to be very scarce. Having one or more black instructors in the freshman year was considered an exceptional stroke of luck, and students frequently referred to such instructors as "role models." However, there seemed to be general agreement and acceptance of the observation "Don't expect special treatment [from black faculty] just because you're black." In fact, in some cases, black faculty were seen as particularly hard on students, but this was interpreted as "They had to learn the hard way; they want you to learn to give what it takes." Black faculty seemed neither more nor less accessible than white faculty to the black students in or out of class; if special help was needed, the students had to seek it out in either case. On an extra-class, one-to-one basis, contacts with black faculty were generally seen as quite helpful and satisfactory. While in 1970 students felt that black faculty had to choose between "being one of us, or being one of them" (and in either case losing their utility for black students), the black faculty now seemed to be an accepted part of the general establishment, with the same pressures (e.g., to publish) that their white cohorts experienced. They were extremely important examples of blacks who had made it, and they served as a model and reminder of what the student could achieve.

The white administrators did not fare as well as the white faculty in the responses to the open-ended questions. Many of the black freshmen cited one or two white administrative staff members who they felt were either prejudiced or unable to understand reasonable black needs or interests. In most cases, this appeared to be a response to rules that were perceived as policing and insensitive to students' interests or to the administrator's lack of enthusiasm for whatever prompted the black student's contact.

Although some students noted that they had selected a white institution in a community where a neighboring black institution could provide social outlets (with "social" meaning heterosexual social activity), most of the four-year campuses (as in 1970) came across as relatively bleak in this regard. Yet, in 1986, the students seemed not to have been surprised by this – many indicated that it was a situation they had anticipated and to which they had reconciled themselves. "If social life is what you want, don't come here," was a frequent comment. Thus, while the students missed this component, there seemed to be less resentment in 1986 because of its absence. Still, the social outlets in private institutions in small communities seemed to be particularly meager, with a gospel choir apparently the only resource in one instance.

The interviewers concluded generally that their experience in the study had made them more sensitive to the problems that black freshmen faced, and that a major source of positive assistance to freshmen could be the upper-class black students. On one campus, there was a formal mentor program, involving the assignment of a big brother or sister to each freshman; this had mixed evaluations, with some freshmen reporting positive experiences and others noting infrequent contact or personality differences between themselves and the mentor. The interviewers' more general advice was for black upperclassmen to be more sensitive to the important role they could play and for black freshmen not to be shy in seeking out, in informal contacts, special advice or assistance.

PERCEPTION OF INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES AND CLIMATE

In 1970, institutional policies – on admissions, black student organizations, curriculum, retention, student conduct, etc. – were very much on the minds of the black freshmen and their interviewers, with each campus among the four-year institutions having developed particular targets for change by protest or by persuasion. In 1986, as the interviews began, it quickly became apparent that institutional policy per se was not a pervasive concern. One interviewer in the process of getting his interviews completed called in to say, "Students here don't seem to know what 'institutional policies' are; incidentally, what are we trying to get at?" With a few exceptions, however, most of the black freshmen's concerns seemed no different from the concerns any freshman might have, such as reaction to dorm rules or codes of student conduct. Absent were demands for special space, black courses, recognition of black student groups, representation in student government, etc. Either the institutions have come

Table 5. Proportion of Students with Various Plans for the Following Year, by Type of Institution

Plan	Type of institution		
	Four-year public (N = 93)	Four-year private (N = 66)	Two-year public (N = 93)
"Will definitely return here"	77%	61%	63%
"Will probably return here"	17	30	15
"Will probably drop out of school for good"	0	0	1
"Will probably drop out of school for a time"	0	3	4
"Will probably transfer to another institution"	1	6	14
No response	5	0	3
	100%	100%	100%

around on some of their inadequacies or blind spots in 1970, or they have learned how to handle such concerns without disruption or drama. Another possible explanation is that the reduced cohesiveness of black students may be a cause as well as an effect. But the four-year campuses were decidedly quieter in this regard in 1986, as were the two-year institutions in both years. The less obtrusive nature of institutional policies in 1986 was also apparent in the diffuse responses to the question as to where the "real source of power for change" might lie at each institution, with answers running the gamut from "students" to "president," and in the absence of any distinctive source for any given campus. The students were not consumed, in 1986, with the need to change their environment in drastic ways, but with getting on with their academic work or their career goals. While most felt that the institution had done nothing to keep them there, with several noting that "being wanted" disappeared when their part in helping the institution meet its admissions quotas was over, they were settling in and were relatively tolerant of the environment, whether comfortable or mildly uncomfortable in it.

PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

Students' responses as to what their plans were for the immediate future are given in Table 5. Most were planning to return to the present institution in the following year. For those few planning to transfer, one was "downgrading," or moving from a four-year to a two-year public institution; four (one at a four-year private college and three at a community college) were moving to a TBI; the others were moving to other traditionally white institutions of equal or more selective status. Very few in the four-year institutions anticipated needing more than four years to complete degree requirements; when longer terms were stated, they were generally justified as part of a curriculum requiring longer than four years or as reduced loads because of part-time work. Although the interviews were conducted late in the final term of the freshman year, with many students consumed with some anxiety about the approaching final exams, outlooks were generally optimistic.

THE BLACK STUDENT'S ADVICE TO PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS

In response to questions as to what the student would say about the institution to prospective black students, the public two- or four-year freshmen differed generally from those in the private institutions; yet, within each of the two kinds of institutions, the responses tend to be consistent within the institutional group.

For the black freshmen in the public (two- or four-year) institutions, there was an almost unanimous theme in the advice they would give to other blacks considering their institution, which was "be prepared to work hard." Whatever the students had expected (and whatever their apparent level of academic success thus far), most in the public institutions would stress that personal commitment and hard work were a necessary way of life, and that not recognizing this fact could be disastrous. The occasional athlete in this group might say, as one did, "Don't count on your interest in athletics to keep you here," but the underlying theme was still present. For the black freshmen in the private institutions, the "be prepared to work hard" was much less frequent; instead, the dominant theme had to do with the interpersonal relationships with other students (particularly with black students) and aspects of social life, and it seemed to be more closely related to the particular campus. Students from essentially all-black public schools were felt to need particular advice on what to expect and how to cope in the white college environment.

Thus, the public institution freshmen would advise prospective students to face the realities of hard work, while the private institution freshmen would advise them to face the realities of being black on a predominantly white campus and to recognize the fact that blacks of a variety of orientations were enrolled. However, there are few clues in the data as to why there is this difference. We note that some of the private institutions may be generally more selective and have lower attrition rates than the public institutions, with consequent better fit between academic demands and student ability or with less threat to survival. For two of the private institutions, the larger challenge for the particular interviewees was doing well in athletics. We note, too, that the number or proportion of blacks on the private institution campuses is smaller than that on the public institution campuses. The prospect of interviewer differences that could color the questions or the report of the response, together with the small number of interviewers, could also distort the findings. It is suspected, however, that institutional selectivity, size of black group,

and the particular and characteristic problem areas that seemed to distinguish each private campus (e.g., divisiveness among blacks, absence of social outlets, a preponderance of athletes in the black student body, an administration perceived as hostile) carried over inevitably in the responses to the basic question. But the advice in either instance was more about how black students should interpret their world and live peacefully within it than how to restructure it vis-à-vis whites or the white majority environment.

SOME CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

In general, it would seem that all parties – black students, white students, black faculty, white faculty, and administrative staff – have come a long way since 1970, perhaps as a function of experience over that period, of the continuing desegregation of the public elementary and secondary schools, of the more frequent second generation of college (or, in particular, white college) experience that the black freshmen represent, or of the quieter times in the broader society. The polarization, the militancy, the perception of prejudice as the basis for every real or imagined slight, though not absent for certain students, is no longer pervasive on the campuses involved.

Black students come with fairly pragmatic career interests which their programs are perceived to serve, as before. There seems to be a greater sophistication about white colleges, the social climate, and the need for hard work. Finding oneself a minority still brings new uncasinesses, but this is either less severe or more tolerable than in 1970. The emergence of the black athlete may have helped white students in general to view black students as a normal component of the student body, thus contributing to integration of the campus from the white perspective. Yet, for the black students who are not athletes, the black athlete seems to be more a member of the athletic community than of the black student community on campus. This may be due to the pressure of the coaches for the athletes to live and work primarily with their teammates and the athletes' different relationship with the white majority, or it may be simply the divergence in purpose, with the black non-athletes there to work hard on serious vocational goals that the academic programs support.

The reactions of the group to traditional black institutions – seen in 1970 and in 1986 as inferior in quality and also seen now as less fiscally stable, a more segregated than real world experience, less aggressive in recruiting, and more conducive to fun and games – is of particular significance. This study, unlike that of Jacqueline Fleming,[4] did not involve black students on black campuses, but it nevertheless reflects reasons or rationalizations that may account for the increasing proportion of black students in traditionally white institutions and the erosion of black student admission credentials in many TBIs.

The importance of black faculty in the traditionally white institutions is once again underscored, as are the problems of developing mechanisms that would make the minorities less aware that they are minorities. The hard-work ethic, dear to the upperclassmen, is reflected by the freshmen who intend to persevere. The black student organizations appear to have lost the sense of particular purpose that brought them together two decades ago and to be struggling for some viable redefinition; the black students are more diffused, or are an assortment of subgroups along lines of interests, values, socioeconomic status, or ease in the majority environment, rather than a unified whole.

The findings yield few obvious hypotheses or interpretations as to the leveling off or decline in black student enrollment in higher education; indeed, such a concern would be better served by addressing high school populations. Such matters as responsive recruiting, availability of financial aid, and "selling" the institution on the basis of career potential of particular programs and quality of degree do emerge as ways to attract black students. The campus visits that many of the current black students had made before entrance were positive and effective recruiting devices. Special help for academic problems seems to be generally available and was judged satisfactory by the students, although they would have liked more information on remedial assistance programs prior to enrollment.

The most striking contrast between the 1970 and 1986 black freshmen, however, is in their general response to life as blacks in the predominantly white campus environment. In 1970, the black students found themselves increasingly uneasy, a situation they had not expected – and increasingly aware of being black, increasingly bitter, and increasingly forced to join with other black students for comfort, refuge, or protest. Their problems were attributed to a hostile white-dominated environment that appeared to neither understand nor accept them. In 1986, the black students appeared less uncomfortable, less likely to blame and attack the environment, and more adept at fitting into the larger campus culture. Although most had had experiences that reminded them that they were a minority in a majority context, they were more tolerant or able to put these aspects aside and focus on their long-term goals. The abuses perceived by the black students in 1970 were either sharply reduced, or the students were better able to cope with or ignore them and to get on with their studies. They seemed less aware of cultural differences between themselves and whites, as apparently did their white cohorts.

To some who are knowledgeable about this contrast from having lived or worked on campuses over that period, the current generation of black students "are in a sad state, [because they] have little knowledge of their own history and heritage ... know little of the sacrifices made for them to

4. Fleming, Jacqueline. *Blacks in College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

enter a classroom and get an education . . . know little of their own communities or their own cultures . . . are very materialistic and clearly want to make a lot of money for themselves."[5] The sense of black identity that was prevalent in the earlier, more painful period is felt to be important. If the same inequities exist (and such spokesmen generally assume they do), the current generation appears to be lulled into ignoring these affronts or pretending that they are not there. They are directing their concern to their personal material welfare and have "sold out" as blacks. The spokesman just quoted concludes that "this is a desperate situation."[6] He states that black students need to be awakened to these concerns, but adds that "because of [the black students'] attitudes and states of consciousness, however, this awareness will not easily be accomplished."

There is, of course, another interpretation. The greater tolerance for the environment, the less frequent perception of direct affronts, and the use of the environment as a vehicle for adult life purposes rather than as an arena for resolving the past and current sins of the white majority can be viewed as encouraging to those who have been concerned with the integration as opposed to the desegregation of higher education – or to those administrators who were distraught over the more frequent conflict of two decades ago. But the more critical matter is the legitimate place the succeeding generations of black students appear to have won and their greater facility for coping in this environment. Although there is still a way to go, our colleges and universities (like our society) appear to have made progress. We would also judge, principally on the basis of the thoughtful insights and maturity of the interviewers, that the gains have been honestly won by a new generation of black students who not only are more at ease in a desegregated setting, but who also bring attractive capabilities for the faculty and other students to respect and to harness.

The question for the white majority establishment is: Are we indeed being sufficiently sensitive and nonprejudicial, or have we simply beat down or conditioned out the earlier grievances? For the black leaders, students, or college faculty and staff, the question is: have we made the gains we fought for in earlier times and are we a legitimate and integral part of the educational system, or have we become too complacent? In any event, the more moderate climate may be viewed as one in which problems can more easily and routinely be resolved.

5. Taylor, C. A. "Black Students on Predominantly White College Campuses in the 1980's." *Journal of College Student Personnel*, May 1986, pp. 196–202.
6. Ibid.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A. Institutions Involved and Their Student Interviewers

Institution	*Student Interviewers*
Catawba College	Ms. Sylvia Stephens
Central Piedmont Community College	Ms. Cheryl Langston Mr. Alfred Glover
Duke University	Mr. Gary Wilcox
East Carolina University	Ms. Crystal Fray Mr. Anthony Bunch
Fayetteville Technical Institute	Ms. Ellen McLaurin Mr. Michael Boyd
Gardner-Webb College	Ms. Loleta Dennette Rowe
Guilford College	Ms. Cynthia Duhaney
North Carolina State University	Mr. Alvin Sumpter Ms. Greta Johnson
University of North Carolina: Chapel Hill	Ms. Terri Martin Ms. Camille Roddy
University of North Carolina: Greensboro	Ms. Cynthia Moore Ms. Donna Braswell
Wake Forest University	Mr. Michael Davis
Wake Technical College	Ms. Karen Harris Ms. Carmen Perry
Wayne County Community College	Mr. Charles Jennings Ms. Kimberly Gore

Appendix B. Selected Statistics on Minority Enrollment and Number of Interviews Conducted with Black First-Year Students in the Sample Institutions

	1984 Headcount Enrollment[a]				1985 Freshman Headcount Enrollment[b]				
Institution	No.	% White	% Black	% Other	No.	No. Black	% Black	No. Interviews	% Black Freshmen Interviewed
Catawba College	910	86.9	11.8	1.3	213	19	8.9	15	78.9
Duke University	10,025	87.2	4.0	8.8	1,432	80	5.6	11	13.8
Gardner-Webb College	1,885	90.6	8.4	1.0	223	25	11.2	15	60.0
Guilford College	1,636	89.1	4.8	6.1	337	15	4.5	13	86.7
Wake Forest University	4,961	94.4	3.3	2.3	911	40	4.4	12	30.0
East Carolina University	15,140	86.0	11.2	2.8	2,680	338	12.6	30	8.9
NC State University	23,733	85.3	8.1	6.6	3,501	522	14.9	30	5.7
UNC: Chapel Hill	21,652	87.4	8.3	4.3	3,329	315	9.5	6	1.9
UNC: Greensboro	10,293	87.1	9.9	3.0	1,413	190	13.4	27	14.2
Central Piedmont	26,235	77.9	16.0	6.1	NA	1,902	–	15	0.8
Fayetteville Tech	5,473	64.7	29.9	5.4	NA	650	–	29	4.5
Wayne	2,003	74.8	24.4	.8	NA	480	–	29	6.0
Wake Tech	4,332	80.8	16.5	2.7	NA	206	–	20	9.7

[a]1984 Office of Civil Rights Survey (U.S. Dept. Ed.): *Chronicle of Higher Education vol. 32, No. 21* (July 23, 1986)
[b]Estimates or counts from institutional records

Appendix C: Interview Guide

Institution _____ Date of Interview _____

Student Sex _____ Age _____ Class _____ Full Time? ____ (Part Time)
Credit Hours
Student No. (Assigned by Interviewer)_____ Current Term: ____

I. Reasons for Choice of This Institution

*A. First, let's talk about how you happened to choose this college. You know, why did you come here? What attracted you most? _____

*B. Were there other reasons for this choice? _____

C. Before deciding to come to this institution, did you consider seriously (did you apply to) any other institution? ___ No ___ Yes If yes, which institutions? And, why did you decide not to go there?

Institution	Reason for Deciding Against Going There

(If no traditionally black institutions were named, ask:) Did you consider going to any traditionally black institutions? ___ No ___ Yes What advantages did (do) you see in general in traditionally black institutions? Disadvantages?

Advantages	Disadvantages

Why did you decide not to go to (the traditionally black institution)? _____

D. Did you consider not going to college at all last year? ___ No ___Yes
If yes, what other alternatives were you considering? _____

What changed your mind? _____

*Important Question

*E. Here's another way of looking at why you came to this particular institution. Think back to when you were choosing a 4-year college or a technical college. Which ones of these things I'll read to you were <u>important considerations</u> in choosing to come here? If you're not sure, tell me that, too.

Write any comments below each question.

		Yes	No	Not Sure
1.	Get a better education in a predominantly or traditionally white college	___	___	___
2.	College is close to home (or far from home)	___	___	___
3.	Low cost of education here	___	___	___

At this point, remind student that these refer to why he or she decided to come here.

4.	Good scholarship or financial aid offer	___	___	___
5.	Had visited campus and liked it (was visit campus sponsored, or were you on your own?)_____	___	___	___
6.	Had the academic or technical program I wanted	___	___	___
7.	I was made to feel "wanted" by the college	___	___	___
8.	Recruited by an athletic coach	___	___	___
9.	Interested in the athletic program	___	___	___
10.	Better chance for good job and salary	___	___	___
11.	Chance to speak more forcefully as a black	___	___	___
12.	Had heard good reports from friend(s) here	___	___	___
13.	Parents wanted me to come here	___	___	___
14.	Others in my family have come here	___	___	___
15.	Close friend also planning to come here	___	___	___
16.	Was actively recruited by this institution	___	___	___

		Yes	No	Not Sure
17.	Size of the school (small or large)	___	___	___
18.	Was advised to come here by a teacher	___	___	___
19.	Was advised to come here by a guidance counselor	___	___	___
20.	Was advised to come here by a coach	___	___	___
21.	Reputation of the academic program of the institution	___	___	___
22.	Reputation of the institution in sports	___	___	___
23.	Liked opportunities for social life	___	___	___
24.	Size of the black student population	___	___	___
25.	Felt I could meet the academic requirements	___	___	___
26.	Good opportunities for any special help I might need in academic work	___	___	___
27.	Recommended by other black students who have attended	___	___	___
	(Ask for any others)			
	Anything else?			
28.	_____	___	___	___
29.	_____	___	___	___
30.	_____	___	___	___

* F. Of all these reasons, which was most important in your choice?
_____

II. High School and Family Experience

* A. Did you graduate from high school?____yes _____no. (if no, or if student is over 25 years of age, skip to Question G in this Section (Section II).

* B. Now, let's talk about your high school experience. How well did your high school prepare you for academic work at this college?
___ Very well ___ Generally adequate ___ Not very well

- In what areas was your preparation not very good?_____
_____

- Did you take any honor courses ____no ____yes. If yes, what?_____
_____

- In what areas was your preparation for college very good?

  _____

- How did your high school compare with other schools in your area? _____

  _____

C. Tell me about your high school.
   - How large was it? _____ students.

   - Approximately what proportion of these students were black? _____%

   - Did anyone there influence or help you with your college plans? ___ No ___ Yes If yes, who and how? _____

   _____

   - Were you misled in any way by high school teachers or staff about your ability to handle college work? ____No ____Yes If yes, how? _____

   _____

* D. In what courses were your best grades? _____

E. Were you active in any extracurricular activities (e.g., clubs, sports, student government, etc.)? ___ No ___ Yes If yes, what extra-curricular activities? _____

_____

* F. Is the atmosphere at college different from that in high school? ____No ____Yes If yes, how? _____

_____

G. Tell me about the family you grew up in (note composition; if others attended college) _____

_____

_____

- Did your family try to influence your decision to enter college? ____No ____Yes If yes, how? _____

  _____

  _____

Ask the remaining questions in this Section only if the student did not graduate from high school, or is over 25.

* H. When did you decide to go to college? _____

* I. Have you attended any other college? ____No ____Yes If yes, what college? _____

* J. What have you done since leaving elementary or high school? _____

_____

_____

K. Do you have a high school Diploma? ____ Or passed the GED? ____

III. Contacts with This College Before Entering

What contacts did you have with this college before coming? That is,

* A. Did you know anyone who was here or who had come to this institution? ___ No ___ Yes If yes, what did they have to say about it? _____

_____

B. Contacts with College Representatives

* 1. Did the college contact you or do anything to recruit you? ____No ____Yes If yes, when and what?_____

_____

_____

- How did you react to this?_____

_____

2. Were you personally contacted by anyone recruiting for other colleges? ___ No ___ Yes

3. What was your experience with the admissions office?

a. Application handled efficiently? ___ No ___ Yes

b. Did you interview? ___ No ___ Yes If yes, how did it go? ___ Helpful ___ Uncertain ___ Not very helpful

c. Did you get the information you needed about:

- Costs of tuition and fees ___ No ___ Yes
- Financial Aid ___ No ___ Yes
- Academic and Course Requirements ___ No ___ Yes
- Programs of Study ___ No ___ Yes
- Remedial or Special Courses ___ No ___ Yes
- Housing ___ No ___ Yes
- Social Life ___ No ___ Yes

d. What information, if any, did you receive that was particularly helpful? _____

4. Did you have any contact before coming here with a financial aid officer? ___ No ___ Yes If yes, was this:
___ Very helpful ___ Somewhat helpful ___ Not very helpful

IV. First Year Experience

*A. Now that you're here, what has stood out about this college? What aspects do you really like? _____

_____

_____

What do you dislike? _____

_____

_____

*B. In what ways has this college been different from what you expected? _____

_____

_____

_____

*C. Have you changed since coming here? If yes, what are the most important changes in yourself since coming here---your attitudes, aspirations, outlook, etc.?

_____

_____

_____

D. How do you feel about:

		Satisfied	Indifferent or Undecided	Not Satisfied
*1.	Your grades so far	___	___	___
2.	How hard you've had to work	___	___	___
3.	The teachers' knowledge of their subject matter	___	___	___
4.	The ability of the teachers to teach	___	___	___
*5.	Getting any special help needed	___	___	___
6.	The fairness of grading practices	___	___	___
*7.	The attitude of faculty in general toward black students	___	___	___
*8.	The attitude of administrators in general toward black students	___	___	___

*9. The help you have gotten from your academic advisor ___ ___ ___

*10. Your social life on campus ___ ___ ___

*11. The local black community ___ ___ ___

*E. Who do you go to on campus for help? _____

_____

- Are you aware of any (other) offices or special programs for assisting students like yourself with problems?
____No ____Yes If yes, what are they?_____

_____

- Why haven't you used this (these) resource(s)?_____

_____

F. Now lets talk about the cost of your education here.

*1. Do you have any financial assistance?

What kind and how much?

Yes/No		Amount
___	Pell Grant	$_____
___	Work Study	$_____
___	NDSL	$_____
___	Church	$_____
___	Athletic Scholarship	$_____
___	SEOG	$_____
___	GSL	$_____
___	State Grant (for private college students)	$_____
___	Other (Specify _____)	$_____

2. What other sources of support do you have?

___	Family	$_____	___	Personal loan	$_____
___	Spouse	$_____	___	VA loan	$_____
___	Work	$_____	___	Others-Specify _____	$_____

3. How comfortable are you about being able to meet your expenses for the rest of your time here?

___ Very comfortable
___ Reasonably comfortable
___ Unsure
___ Worried

*4. What do you expect your total loan indebtedness to be by the time you graduate? $_____

*G. Do you currently work full or part time?____No ____Yes If yes, how many hours a week?____ what do you do?_____

_____

*H. Tell me about your friends and contacts here.

1. Are they: ___ all black ___ mostly black ___ mixed

   ___ mostly white ___ all white

2. How do you feel about most black students here?

   _____

   _____

   - Is there pressure to identify with them more than you'd like? ___ Yes ___ Uncertain ___ No

3. When you get together with other black students here, what do you do:_____

   _____

4. What about the social life? How good are the programs, functions, opportunities?

   _____

   _____

   _____

5. Are you involved in any formal or informal student groups, clubs, movements, etc.? ___ No ___ Yes If so, what are they, and what purposes are they serving?

Group	Purposes
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

6. Are there any student support or social programs that aren't working? ___No ___Yes If yes, what programs, and why aren't they working? _____

   _____

7. How do you feel about most white students here?

   _____

   _____

   - Have white students given you any trouble? Or other black students? What and why?

     _____

     _____

8. How do you feel about most white faculty here? _____

   _____

9. Have you had any formal or informal contacts with black faculty or staff?

   ___ No ___ Yes How do you feel about them? _____

   _____

   Are they accessible? ___ Yes ___ No

V. The Policies and Climate: Recommendations for Changes

*A. What changes would you like to see made in the institution or its general policies?

a. Administrative policies: _____

_____

b. Practices and traditions: _____

_____

c. Courses and programs: _____

_____

d. Counseling, study aids, academic assistance, etc.: _____

_____

e. Recruiting and admission policies in particular: _____

_____

f. Faculty: _____

_____

g. Academic Advisers: _____

_____

B. What are your suggestions for bringing about some of these changes?

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. Where do you believe the real source of power for change lies at this institution?

_____

VI. Plans for the Future

*A. What are your plans for next year?

a. ___ Will definitely return here
b. ___ Will probably return here
c. ___ Will probably drop out of school for good
d. ___ Will probably drop out of school for a time, and then _____
e. ___ Will probably transfer to _____

*B. What has this college done, if anything, to keep you here?

_____

_____

*C. How long do you expect it will take to complete your program of studies here? _____ (If more or less than usual time) Why?

_____

_____

*D. Do you plan to continue your studies at another college after you finish here? ___ No ___ Uncertain ___ Yes

- If yes, where? _____
- What program or major? _____
- Why does this appeal to you? _____

_____

VII. Advice to Prospective Students

Thinking back about all we've talked about--reasons for choosing this college, your high school experience, your contacts with the college before coming, your experiences so far, and your recommendations for changes:

*A. What advice would you give to black students considering this particular college or technical institution? _____

_____

_____

B. How can guidance counselors or others advising black students best help? _____

_____

_____

C. Any other advice or suggestions?

_____

_____

1. Thank the student for his time and advice.

2. Check to see that you have asked (and gotten some answer for) all the questions.

3. After the student has left, write down any further significant comments or observations on the bottom of this page, including such things as whether the student seemed to be at ease, whether he told it like it is, whether he seems to be comfortable at this institution (academically and socially).

4. Now go back and correct and clarify your notes, and make them readable throughout the interview schedule.

5. Mail the completed questionnaire to RTI in the envelope provided.

INTERVIEWER'S NAME _____

Time Required for Interview: _____

Comments: (use other side if necessary)